



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,999	04/17/2006	Jayshree Bharatia	16469RRUS03N	9376
Docket Clerk P.O. Drawer 800889 Dallas, TX 75380			EXAMINER VIANA DI PRISCO, GERMAN	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/05/2011	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/575,999

Applicant(s)

BHARATIA ET AL.

Examiner

GERMAN VIANA DI PRISCO

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-15 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-15 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-SB-03)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 6, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 102 (e) as being anticipated by Mezhvinsky et al (Pub. No.: US 2003/0087648 A1, hereinafter Mezhvinsky).

Consider claim 1, Mezhvinsky clearly shows and discloses a method of obtaining location information for emergency services comprising the steps of:

receiving a first request message (forwarded user request, step 2 in Fig. 5) from a multimedia server (Web server 50) in response to the multimedia server receiving an emergency request message from user equipment (UE) (user requests a service, step 1 in Fig. 5 and paragraph 105; the service can be an emergency service, paragraph 76);

communicating a location request in response to receiving the first request message (user CLI (calling line identification) is forwarded to Mobile Network Location Engine 120 in order to update the current user location information, step 4 in Fig. 5 and paragraph 105);

receiving a location response in response to communicating the location request, the location response comprising location information of the UE (user location details returned, step 6 in Fig. 5 and paragraph 105); and

communicating a second request message to the multimedia server in response to receiving the location response (job reference sent to web server in step 13 so that the Web Server 50 informs the user of the response in step 14, see Fig. 5 and paragraph 105).

Consider claim 6, and as applied to claim 1 above, Mezhvinsky further discloses wherein the location request is a mobile terminal location request (user CLI (calling line identification) is forwarded to Mobile Network Location Engine 120 in order to update the current user location information, step 4 in Fig. 5 and paragraph 105).

Consider claim 9, Mezhvinsky clearly shows and discloses a communication system comprising:

a multimedia server (Web Server 50) for receiving an emergency request message from user equipment (UE) (user request a service, step 1 in Fig. 5) and, in response thereto, generating a first request message (forwarded user request, step 2 in Fig. 5 and paragraph 105);

a location application server (SmartMove Application Server 100) communicatively coupled to the multimedia server for receiving the first request message and generating a one of: a location request and a routing information request ((user CLI (calling line identification) is forwarded to Mobile Network Location Engine 120 in order to update the current user location information, step 4 in Fig. 5 and paragraph 105);

a gateway server (Mobile Network Location Engine 120) communicatively coupled to

the location application server for receiving a one of: the location request ((user CLI (calling line identification) is forwarded to Mobile Network Location Engine 120 in order to update the current user location information, step 4 in Fig. 5 and paragraph 105) and the routing information request, and for generating an acknowledgement response comprising at least a one of: location information of the UE (user location details returned, step 6 in Fig. 5) and routing information associated with the UE enabling a request for location information of the UE; and

wherein the location application server is operable for receiving the acknowledgement response (job reference sent to Web Server 50, step 13) and for communicating at least a one of: the location information and the routing information to the multimedia server (location information is presented to the user, as shown in Fig. 9 and paragraph 118).

Consider claim 12, Mezhvinsky clearly shows and discloses a method of obtaining location information for emergency services comprising the steps of:

receiving a first request message (forwarded user request, step 2 in Fig. 5) from a multimedia server (Web server 50) in response to the multimedia server receiving an emergency request message from user equipment (UE) (user requests a service, step 1 in Fig. 5 and paragraph 105; the service can be an emergency service, paragraph 76);

communicating a request for routing information in response to receiving the first request message (user CLI (calling line identification) is forwarded to Mobile Network Location Engine 120 in order to update the current user location information, step 4 in Fig. 5 and paragraph 105);

receiving a routing information acknowledgement in response to communicating the request for routing information, the routing information acknowledgement comprising at least a one of: location information of the UE and routing information associated with the UE enabling a request for location information of the UE (user location details returned, step 6 in Fig. 5 and paragraph 105); and

communicating a second request message to the multimedia server in response to receiving the request for routing information acknowledgement (job reference sent to web server in step 13 so that the Web Server 50 informs the user of the response in step 14, see Fig. 5 and paragraph 105).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 2-5, 8, 10, 13-15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mezhvinsky in view of Kauppinen et al (Pub. No.: US 2007/0097967 A1, hereinafter Kauppinen).

Consider claim 2 and as applied to claim 1 above, Mezhvinsky does not expressly disclose wherein the multimedia server is a serving control function server.

In the same field of endeavor Kauppinen discloses wherein the multimedia server is a serving control function server (see Fig. 3 paragraph 38).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Kauppinen with the teachings of Mezhvinsky in order to enable emergency sessions in a reliable manner.

Consider claim 3 and as applied to claim 1 above, Mezhvinsky does not expressly disclose wherein the multimedia server is a Session Initiation Protocol enabled server.

In the same field of endeavor Kauppinen discloses wherein the multimedia server is a Session Initiation Protocol enabled server (see Fig. 3 paragraphs 2 and 45).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Kauppinen with the teachings of Mezhvinsky in order to enable emergency sessions in a reliable manner.

Consider claim 4 and as applied to claim 1 above, Mezhvinsky does not expressly disclose wherein the method is performed at session initiation.

In the same field of endeavor Kauppinen discloses wherein the method is performed at session initiation (see Fig. 4).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Kauppinen with the teachings of Mezhvinsky in order to enable emergency sessions in a reliable manner.

Consider claim 5 and as applied to claim 1 above, Mezhvinsky does not expressly disclose wherein the first request is a Session Initiation Protocol INVITE request message. In the same field of endeavor Kauppinen discloses wherein the first request is a Session Initiation Protocol INVITE request message (see Fig. 4).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Kauppinen with the teachings of Mezhvinsky in order to enable emergency sessions in a reliable manner.

Consider claim 8 and as applied to claim 1 above, Mezhvinsky does not expressly disclose wherein the second request is a Session Initiation Protocol INVITE request message.

In the same field of endeavor Kauppinen discloses wherein the second request is a Session Initiation Protocol INVITE request message (see Fig. 4).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Kauppinen with the teachings of Mezhvinsky in order to enable emergency sessions in a reliable manner

Consider claim 10 and as applied to claim 9 above, Mezhvinsky does not expressly disclose wherein the multimedia server is a Session Initiation Protocol enabled server.

In the same field of endeavor Kauppinen discloses wherein the multimedia server is a Session Initiation Protocol enabled server (see Fig. 3 paragraphs 2 and 45).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Kauppinen with the teachings of Mezhvinsky in order to enable emergency sessions in a reliable manner.

Consider claim 13 and as applied to claim 12 above, Mezhvinsky does not expressly disclose wherein the multimedia server is a serving control function server.

In the same field of endeavor Kauppinen discloses wherein the multimedia server is a serving control function server (see Fig. 3 paragraph 38).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Kauppinen with the teachings of Mezhvinsky in order to enable emergency sessions in a reliable manner.

Consider claim 14 and as applied to claim 12 above, Mezhvinsky does not expressly disclose wherein the multimedia server is a Session Initiation Protocol enabled server.

In the same field of endeavor Kauppinen discloses wherein the multimedia server is a Session Initiation Protocol enabled server (see Fig. 3 paragraphs 2 and 45).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Kauppinen with the teachings of Mezhvinsky in order to enable emergency sessions in a reliable manner.

Consider claim 15 and as applied to claim 12 above, Mezhvinsky does not expressly disclose wherein the first request is a Session Initiation Protocol INVITE request message.

In the same field of endeavor Kauppinen discloses wherein the first request is a Session Initiation Protocol INVITE request message (see Fig. 4).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Kauppinen with the teachings of Mezhvinsky in order to enable emergency sessions in a reliable manner.

Consider claim 18 and as applied to claim 12 above, Mezhvinsky does not expressly disclose wherein the second request is a Session Initiation Protocol INVITE request message.

In the same field of endeavor Kauppinen discloses wherein the second request is a Session Initiation Protocol INVITE request message (see Fig. 4).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Kauppinen with the teachings of Mezhvinsky in order to enable emergency sessions in a reliable manner.

5. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mezhvinsky in view of De-Poorter (Pub. No.: US 2006/0195565 A1).

Consider claim 11 and as applied to claim 9 above, Mezhvinsky does not expressly disclose wherein the multimedia server is an H.323 enabled server.

In the same field of endeavor De-Poorter discloses wherein the multimedia server is an H.323 enabled server (see Fig. 3 paragraphs 2 and 45).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Kauppinen with the teachings of Mezhvinsky in order to enable emergency sessions in a reliable manner.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Faccin et al (Pub. No.: US 2010/0067444 A1) discloses emergency telephone calls in an

IP based packet switched wireless communications network.

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to** (571) 273-8300 or **mailed to**:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to German Viana Di Prisco whose telephone number is (571) 270-1781. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rafael Perez-Gutierrez can be reached on (571) 272-7915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 571-

Art Unit: 2617

272-4100.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

/Germán Viana Di Prisco/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617